

Appl. No. : 09/828,550
Filed : April 6, 2001

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Interview Summary

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Zervigon for the courteous telephone interview extended to, Applicant's representatives, Rabinder Narula, on Tuesday, November 25th, 2003 and the courteous personal interview extended to Applicant's representatives, Rabinder Narula and Adeel Ahtarar on Tuesday, December 9, 2003.

During the telephone interview, independent Claim 55 was discussed. During the personal interview, independent Claims 1 and 55 were discussed. In both interviews, Applicant discussed Johnsgard (6,342,691), Shih et al. (6,120,640), and Koike (5,065,698).

During the personal interview, Applicant proposed to amend Claim 1 to include the limitations of Claim 5. In this amendment, Claim 1 has been amended as proposed and now includes the limitations of Claim 5, which has been canceled.

The principal argument presented in both interviews is that the cited art did not disclose teach or suggest a divitrification barrier coating on CVD equipment having a thickness between about 1 and 10,000 angstroms. Johnsgard disclosed an insulating reactor wall that may be coated with a reflective layer of silicon nitride. However, Johnsgard did not disclose a thickness for this reflective coating. Shih disclosed an erosion resistant barrier of silicon nitride as an alternative to B₄C. However, Shih does not cure the deficiency in Johnsgard because Shih did not disclose a thickness for the replacement silicon nitride barrier and, in addition, the disclosed thickness of the B₄C barrier is larger than 10,000 angstroms. See Col. 9, lines 19-25 and Col. 10, lines 50-65. Koike disclosed depositing a SiN₄ layer with a thickness of 800Å on a substrate. See Col. 10, lines 20-26. However, there is no motivation to apply the substrate deposition techniques of Koike to deposition on reactor equipment, particularly in view of Johnsgard's desire for a reflective coating.

An agreement was not reached during the interview. However, the Examiner did suggest that adding the limitations of Claim 5 to Claim 1 would advance prosecution.

Appl. No. : 09/828,550
Filed : April 6, 2001

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-3, 9 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Johnsgard et al. (6,342,691). Claims 1-4, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wengert (6,325,858). Claims 4, 13, 14, 47, 55-62 and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Johnsgard in combination with Shih et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,342,691). Claims 5-8, 48, 63 and 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Johnsgard and Koike (U.S. Patent No. 5,065,698). Claims 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Wengert. Claims 46 and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Wengert in view of Koike.

As set forth above, Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections. Nevertheless, to advance prosecution, with respect to Claims 1-10, 13, 14, 46, and 48, Applicant has amended independent Claim 1 and canceled Claim 5 as described above. With respect to Claims 55-65, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider these claims in view of the comments made above. Namely, the primary reference does not teach a thickness within the recited range of independent Claims 1 and 55 and the secondary references do not suggest such thickness for coating CVD equipment.

Request for Continued Examination

This Amendment is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is most earnestly solicited.


The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to all of the rejections in the case and to place the claims in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicant's attorney in order to resolve such issue promptly.

Appl. No. : 09/828,550
Filed : April 6, 2001

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: December 23, 2003

By: 

Rabinder N. Narula
Registration No. 53,371
Attorney of Record
2040 Main Street
Fourteenth Floor
Irvine, CA 92614
(949) 760-0404

H:\DOCS\RN\NRNN-7547.DOC
122203